



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lot of the non-essentials from many of the academic freedom cases as well as establishing certain ethical standards. The right of a university professor to leave his chair after a two weeks' notice is claimed by a few men in faculties as wholly within their privilege because the university is great and they are only one. On the other hand, when a university calls for a resignation with several months' notice, the claim is made, sometimes, that the dismissal is due to failure to meet the views of the president or board of trustees. So academic freedom comes in as a part of the controversy. Fortunately this sort of case does not arise very often, but the American Association of University Professors can render a real service if standards of ethical relation can be established as the basis for the action of members of faculties and governing boards."—*President F. L. McVey, The Quarterly Journal of North Dakota University, April, 1920.*

DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION.—

"The reason for democracy in the university is the same as the reason for every extension of the franchise in the outside world. It is needed for the education of those to whom it is extended. Democracy is needed in the university for the education of the faculty. It is the peculiar disadvantage of the profession of teaching that its members come into close contact with less mature minds with respect to whom they occupy a position of advantage which they can easily abuse if temperamentally inclined. They have little real contact with the outside world, for the reason that so far academic freedom is limited by college walls. Mr. W. H. Allen recently called attention to the fact that there was no college professor upon either of the industrial commissions appointed by President Wilson and asked the reason why. The reason is not far to seek. It is that university professors are not free to discuss current economic, social and political questions in the outside world unless their opinions conform to prevailing standards. Possibly this statement would be questioned by a majority of the members of university faculties, but that would be because the special interests of the majority do not lead them seriously to consider such questions. Barred from close contact with the outside world the only place in which university professors meet their equals is in discussion in university faculties and these discussions are vain and valueless

unless they involve a share in the determination of the vital problems of university administration.

"The strongest reason, however, for democratic administration in universities is that it is necessary to the self-respect of the instructor, and this reason applies as strongly to workers in secondary schools as to professors in universities. The startling fact in the educational world today is the wholesale desertion of the teaching profession by teachers of all grades. This is attributed and is chiefly due to low salaries. But this is only a part of the explanation. Even if salaries could be made adequate it would not meet the situation. Inquiries made with a view of filling vacancies in the University faculty disclose the fact that competent men cannot be had at any price. The tide cannot be turned until there is an improvement in the position of the teacher, until he ceases to be regarded as hired help, and is given a voice in the conduct of the enterprise to which he devotes his life. In this way and in no other can the type of men and women who formerly entered the teaching profession be called back to it.

"But the chief beneficiaries of democratic administration in the university will be the executives. No one proposes under existing American conditions to abolish the university president or the university dean. No one even proposes to curtail in the slightest degree their executive authority. That democracy in no way militates against executive power is evidenced by the fact that the American president is the most powerful executive in the world. What is proposed is that executives shall share the exercise of legislative power with their faculties, and legislative power includes a voice in the apportionment of the funds available for university purposes. That legislation and control of the purse go hand in hand is a basic principle of British and American liberty. It is in vain to contend that there is a share in the control of university policy unless there is also a share in the control of the means through which alone university policy is carried out. The president and deans would have a veto upon faculty recommendations, but it should, I think, be a suspensive veto like that of the president of the United States and the state governors. There is no danger that faculties who look to their executives for educational leadership will block the program of executives in whom they have confidence. There is no question

but that the office of university president is one of great difficulty and chiefly because it involves two distinct tasks which call for ability of different kinds. One is the task of internal administration and the other is the task of successfully presenting the needs of the institution to the public. If there is complete cooperation between university executives and faculties in the determination of university policy, if all business is done openly and all accounts made public, grounds for suspicions and misunderstandings will disappear, executive officers will be strengthened and the burden of their responsibility will be lightened. That such a consummation will eventually come in all educational institutions, as it has already come in some, there can be no room for doubt. That it may come soon is a matter of great moment for the rehabilitation of the teaching profession and for the safety of our education system."—*F. H. Hodder, Graduate Magazine, University of Kansas.*